

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

TERRI PECHNER-JAMES and)	
SONIA FERNANDEZ,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	Civil Action No.03cv12499-MLW
v.)	
)	
CITY OF REVERE et. al.)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER ON DISCOVERY MOTIONS

SOROKIN, M.J.

October 12, 2005

After the hearing, Judge Wolf referred this case for all pretrial matters and recommendations on all dispositive motions. The parties are to submit a revised proposed joint schedule providing for a prompt resolution of this matter beginning with plaintiffs' disclosures due on December 6, 2005. The parties should submit this proposed schedule by October 17, 2005. By that date, the parties should also report to the clerk whether or not they wish to consent to jurisdiction by the Magistrate-Judge. Counsel are to appear for a status conference on **November 22, 2005 at 2:00 p.m.** to discuss the progress of the case.

For the reasons stated on the record during the hearing, the Court makes the following rulings on the pending motions.

1. Plaintiff's Request for a Rooker-Feldman Ruling is DENIED (Docket #53).
2. Defendant's Motion to Strike the Opposition to the Ambrosino Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED (Docket #64).
3. Defendant's Motion to Compel Answers to Interrogatories is ALLOWED as follows:

the Court ORDERS each plaintiff to respond to defendant's Interrogatories on or before December 6, 2005 (Docket #46).

4. Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for a Protective Order (Docket #33) is DENIED.

5. Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production and Sanctions under Rule 37 is DENIED except that the defendant City of Revere shall produce to plaintiffs the detail pay information regarding each plaintiff and the detail pay information (or if non-existent the assignment information) per officer for the period 1995 to 2001 (Docket #34).

6. Defendant's Motion for Relief from the Time Limit is ALLOWED based upon plaintiffs' counsel's stipulation in open court. Defendants may depose each plaintiff for up to three days (Docket # 59).

7. Defendant's Motion to Compel Production of Documents and Award of Expenses is DENIED except that plaintiffs' are ORDERED to produce the documents by December 6, 2005.

8. Defendants' Motion for Sanctions (Docket #70), Plaintiffs' Motion for Sanctions (Docket #74), Defendants' Motion to Strike (Docket #75) and Defendants' Motion for Sanctions (#77) are DENIED.

9. Defendants' Motion for Leave to File (Docket #50) an excess page memorandum of forty pages in support of an upcoming motion for summary judgment is ALLOWED, reluctantly.

/s/ LEO T. SOROKIN
Leo T. Sorokin
United States Magistrate Judge